REMARKS

Claims 1-5 have been examined. With this amendment, Applicants cancel claim 2 and add claims 6-10. Claims 1 and 3-10 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Formalities

Applicants thank the Examiner for initialing and returning a copy of the form PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 10, 2004.

Applicants request that the Examiner indicate whether the Formal Drawing filed on August 10, 2004, has been accepted in the next Office Action.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi *et al.* (US 5,830,086) ["Hayashi"] in view of Tsunoda *et al.* (US 2002/0183135) ["Tsunoda"]. For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicants have incorporated the allowed subject matter of claim 2 into claim 1 and have canceled claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for finding allowable subject matter in claims 2-5 and for indicating that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including.

Applicants have incorporated the allowed subject matter of claim 2 into independent claims 1 and have amended the dependencies of claims 3-5. Applicants submit that claims 1 and 3-5 are allowable.

IV. New Claims

With this amendment Applicants add claims 6-10. Applicants are submitting herewith a declaration executed by Mr. Watanabe, one of the inventors, in support of the arguments given below for the patentability of claims 6-10.

With respect to independent claim 6, Applicants submit that Hayashi does not disclose at least the cover resin composition having a melt flow rate (MFR) of at least 4. In the enclosed declaration, Mr. Watanabe states that the MFR for the cover compositions in Examples (E1-E5) of Hayashi are as follows.

Cover		E1	E2	E3	E4	E5
(Outer layer)	Himilan 1605	-	-	50	30	30
	Himilan 1706	-	-	50	-	-
	Himilan 1601	50	50	-	-	-
	Himilan 1557	50	50	-	50	50
	Himilan 1856	-	-	-	20	20
	Surlyn	-	-	-	-	-
Melt Flow Rate (MFR)		2.1	2.1	1.7	2.7	2.7

From the above Table, one can easily see that the claimed MFR range of at least 4 is patentably different than the MFR of each cover composition of E1-E5 of Hayashi. In fact, the MFR of each cover of Hayashi is close to that of Comparative Example 4 of the present specification (see Tables 2 and 3). Thus, Hayashi arguably teaches away from the claimed cover's melt flow rate and the feature thereof. In addition, Applicants submit that the cover resin composition of Hayashi would be poor in flow and would be difficult to mold into a cover.

Further, Applicants submit that Hayashi does not disclose or suggest that the core "is formed of a rubber composition containing polybutadiene synthesized with a rare-earth catalyst as base rubber," as set forth in claim 6. Hayashi fails to disclose that polybutadiene is synthesized with a rare-earth catalyst. Applicants submit that being synthesized with a rare-earth catalyst brings about good resilience of the ball (as described in the present specification). Thus, the characteristics of the present golf gall, as set forth in claim 6, are advantageously different from the characteristics of the golf balls in Hayashi. Accordingly, Claim 6 is patentable over the teachings of Hayashi. Tsunoda does not cure the deficient teachings of Hayashi.

Tsunoda does not disclose or suggest a cover resin composition having a MFR of at least 4, and Tsunoda is silent with respect to polybutadiene synthesized with a rare-earth catalyst. In the Examples listed in Table 2, Tsunoda discloses that the trade name of the polybutadiene is "BR01," which is synthesized with Ni catalyst (i.e., not a rare-earth catalyst). Accordingly, Tsunoda does not disclose or suggest the claimed polybutadiene synthesized with a rare-earth catalyst.

With respect to claim 7, Hayashi is silent on a core containing organosulfur compounds and its effects. Accordingly, Hayashi fails to disclose or suggest adding organosulfur compounds to core in order to improve the rebound and increase the initial velocity of the golf ball. In addition, Hayashi and Tsunoda (taken alone or in combination) do not disclose or suggest the claimed cover resin composition having a melt flow rate (MFR) of at least 4 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 6 and 7 are patentable over the cited references (taken alone or in combination). Applicants also submit that claims 8-10 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies, as well as the features set forth therein.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Bhaskar Kakarla
Registration No. 54,627

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 23, 2005